Islamic Extremist Propaganda by the Economist (2007)

In a previous article, I criticized a provocative forgery that was shamelessly published in the Economist (under a subversive title "The Meaning of Freedom"). The title of, and the link to, the article are as per below:
Put a Headscarf on Elizabeth II, not on Turkey's First Lady! (2007)
https://megalommatis.wordpress.com/put-a-headscarf-on-elizabeth-ii-not-on-turkeys-first-lady-2007/

I rebuked the erroneous assumption that the Islamic headscarf is just an innocent piece of fabric that makes no problem in the proper function of a democratic society.

As I had already explained the incompatibility of that antihuman piece of fabric with Democracy, I re-published excerpts from an authoritative book describing the daily life at the times of Harun al Rashid in Baghdad; this was enough to demonstrate that authentic, historical, Islam was comfortable with tolerance towards free sexual life, appreciation of material pleasures, involving debauchery, cabarets, dance, concerts, excessive drinking of wine and other alcoholic drinks, etc., thus fully isolating the elements, which later prevailed throughout the Islamic world and gradually became over the past few centuries the epicenter of a new, ahistorical Islam over the past decades.

Islamic Extremism and Terrorism is precisely the rejection of historical Islam

in favor of an ahistorical, falsified Islam that Western colonial powers have always tried to support and diffuse within Muslims, ever since they interfered in the Islamic world (starting mainly with Napoleon), as this consists in the best way of besotting people and preparing idiotic and therefore easily manipulative politicians and 'statesmen'. That is why I suggested to the demented columnist to consider placing a headscarf on Queen Elizabeth's head.

In the present article, I intend to continue the refutation of the Economist's overt misinformation.

Headscarf equals Swastika

Immediately after the presentation of the Turkish foreign minister's wife, the columnist writes the following:

"Yet if there is one big reason why the candidacy of Mr. Gül—whose elevation by parliament has been vetoed by a court, triggering a political crisis and an early election—sparks strong emotions, it is the silk fabric that frames Mrs. Gül's expressive features."

This is another ridiculous effort of multi-dimensional misinformation; there is no political crisis in Turkey; there is Western European political interference of monumental dimensions; that's all! Mr. Gül could surely not be elected as President of the Republic in Turkey because his party represents less than one third of the Turks. It got a disproportionate number of parliament seats only because of the electoral law, and the 2002 multi-division of his opponents, who started now joining forces in view of the forthcoming elections.

The Economist's vicious misinformation passes through the word 'court'; the parliamentary vote was cancelled (not vetoed) by the Supreme Court of Turkey, not … just a court. But of course this is the way the vicious and heinous columnist had been ordered to write in order to promote a candidate bought up by foreign, anti-Turkish, interests with connection with the Economist.

Even worse, Mr. Gül's candidacy "sparks emotions" not because of the headscarf of that Hayrünnisa woman, the Turkish foreign minister's quasi-illiterate and vulgar wife, but because the headscarf is the symbol of those who, altering Islam, want to impose excision on all the women of the country.

The simple answer to the Economist's columnist is this:

Turkish women reject excision as both, anti-Islamic and anti-human. And they reject the headscarf that symbolizes an excised woman, a shockingly wounded creature able enough to be submitted to a man as the lowest type of domestic slaves. That's why excision and headscarf must be outlawed (as f. i.:

http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/WorkingDocs/doc01/EDOC9102.htm), and the Western societies must proceed with the legal classification of domestic slavery, clearly stipulating excision and imposition of headscarf as keystones of it.

Since the Economist columnist speaks of a "piece of fabric" that "sparks emotions", and seems not to consider the 'emotions' and the fears as absolutely justified, I should ask his opinion why the emotions and the fears were justified when Prince Harry wore a "non-innocent piece of fabric" the design of which was a swastika.

The connection between Erdogan, Gül, Osama Bin Laden, and the Taliban

To further proceed with his misinformation, the columnist quotes the loathsome and coarse Hayrünnisa woman, trying to 'prove' her modernity. The discussion goes about driving a car, as if this testifies to civilization, culture, and respect for human rights!

Modernity is not a value; and actually, Osama bin Laden is very, very modern!

The hint is made as regards the most backward, obscurantist and murderous regimes of the world, namely Saudi Arabia and its creature and derivative, Taliban's Afghanistan. Thinking that behind the Taliban regime was Osama bin Laden and not the entire criminal and inhuman state of Arabia is simply pure naivety.

"I am a modern woman, I can hold my own with foreign leaders and their spouses," Mrs. Gül (pictured above with Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands) told your correspondent this week. Nor does the tall, loquacious mother of three -a more lively figure than any of Turkey's recent presidential spouses- favor a draconian regime of the Taliban kind. "I used to drive Abdullah to work and the children to school," she says. "So I couldn't imagine living in a country where women cannot drive."

The excerpt is unbelievable for the dissimulation that it reveals! We already retrograded so much that we reached the point whereby we can compare Western and Westernized Turkey to Afghanistan and Saudi Arabia. Reading through the lines, we come to realize that Turkey is not like Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan; it is different, but since the comparison is made, we understand they the countries are already comparable.

This reveals all the essence of the Islamist conspiracy; what was not possible to be compared before 10 years is being comparable now; apparently, further developments will ensure that after 10 years the presently compared states will become just identical. Wonderful! And reasonably, we are expected or

rather we are called to believe this!

Follow in detail the camouflage of the Hayrünnisa churlish woman: she does not 'favor' the criminal and inhuman gangsters of Afghanistan, so we can deduce that she can eventually tolerate them! This verb illuminates perfectly well the inherent link between the Turkish thuggish duet (Erdogan and Gül) and Osama Bin Laden, Mullah Umar, and the other Afghani Taliban.

The wife of the Turkish foreign minister just does not 'favor' the measures introduced by the Islamic terrorists in Afghanistan; and the Economist publishes this criminal sentence without denouncing, without rebuking, without criticizing, and without expressing indignation on behalf of the entire Mankind!

And what term has been used for the description of the nature of the Taliban regime? Just 'draconian'! The word means 'severe' and it is made out of the personal name of Draco, an ancient Athenian legislator. Draco was a human being inclined to introduce severe laws. Quite contrarily, the Taliban ruled without laws, promoted the cultivation of opium and the trade of narcotics, imposed tyrannical and inhuman social conditions on the women, and de-personalized them totally, reducing them to soulless tools of reproduction.

But Draco had not ordered the destruction of Buddha statues and similar monuments of cultural heritage.

It is quite revelatory that the Hayrünnisa lewd woman does not criticize for a moment the backward, Afghani and the Saudi societies. This shows the clear degradation of the situation, which is not acceptable to any democratic Turk and to any democratic person all over the world. In 1997, the wife of the Turkish foreign minister would describe these societies as sinister, appalling and inhuman. Today, the Hayrünnisa woman finds them just not up to her taste! In ten years, if the situation is left like that, another Turkish Foreign Minister's wife will find them normal and acceptable! And possible to imitate!

To this disgusting discourse, the Economist's columnist finds good reason to add a perversely false compliment; the Hayrünnisa quasi-illiterate woman becomes for the needs of his forgery "a more lively figure than any of Turkey's recent presidential spouses". Probably the Economist's pathetic and ridiculous correspondent in Ankara is not only totally ignorant of the country itself, but also totally unacquainted with the Turkish political establishment. He must have never heard the name of Semra Özal, wife of the former President Turgut Özal.

However, I wonder why the Economist correspondent did not ask this analphabetic Hayrünnisa woman to express her opinion about excision. Who knows! Perhaps Mrs. Gül would suggest excision as a good practice for all the

English princesses and queens.

If the English do not react to this blasphemous, anti-Western, anti-English, anti-Christian forgery of the Economist, they will prove that excision is all that a Queen of England deserves.

Note: Persian Qajar dynasty painting demonstrates that real, historical Muslim women were not covered like the Islamic terrorist wife of the present Turkish Prime Minister.

By Prof. Dr. Muhammad Shamsaddin Megalommatis
Published: 5/21/2007